HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 27 Wednesday, July 8, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

FOREIGN POLICY: *America undermined* (page 1)

SOUND DOLLAR: *A lesson from history* (page 2)

WARREN: *The cocktail hour* (page 2)

EDUCATION: *Graduating to a deficit* (page 3)

STRAUSS: *Senate gets Red plaudits* (page 3)

Dulles Betrayed: In Washington, a process has started that may repudiate the "hold-the-line-against-communism" legacy of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before—figuratively speaking—he's cold in the grave. Such, at any rate, is the comment of Capital observers who have been watching developments among our present foreign policy directors.

One of these developments goes far to confirm a warning reported in HUMAN EVENTS last March 11. At that time, we predicted a "well orchestrated drive for the appointment of Ambassador (to the Philippines) Charles Bohlen to the White House as a special adviser on relations with Soviet Russia." Last week, the Washington press said Secretary of State Christian Herter told President Eisenhower he wants the services of Bohlen "as top adviser on Soviet affairs." News stories at that time said Herter "did not regard Bohlen in the same light as did Dulles, who was reported to have felt that Bohlen was too closely attuned to the thinking of Democratic ex-Secretary Dean Acheson." Inquiry by HUMAN EVENTS along Diplomatic Row draws the word that Bohlen is as good as "in" unless leaders in Congress protest vigorously.

It is recalled that in 1953 newly installed President Eisenhower put up Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia and a strong but unsuccessful fight was waged in the Senate against confirmation. At the time, Bohlen was labeled the "architect of the Yalta sell-out" to Stalin, and the "grave-digger of Poland."

Bohlen had advised Roosevelt on Eastern European questions at the vital Teheran and Yalta conferences.

Dulles—it is well known—had little use for Bohlen, and finally got the President to shift Bohlen from Moscow to the faraway post in Manila. For Bohlen, it seems, had (despite much publicized claims of his omniscience in Russian matters) sold Ike on initiating personal correspondence with Russian Marshal Georgi Zhukov, whom Ike had known in Berlin in 1945. The objective was to build up Zhukov in Soviet eyes and to utilize him as a "pro-American" influence in obtaining a Russo-American rapprochement. All that followed the exchange of letters was that the Kremlin demoted Zhukov, who has now completely disappeared from the Russian public scene. This dud enabled Dulles to point out to Ike the shortcomings of Bohlen as an "adviser" on Russia and to send him to Manila to improve his golf.

Now the usual claque of "liberal" columnists, which has "built up" Bohlen as such an "expert," has succeeded in selling the notion to Secretary Herter. In other words, the forces of appeasement have scored a big victory in the new Bohlen affair.

This development further confirms the negative estimates of Herter now prevailing on Washington's Diplomatic Row (as reported last week). From the windows of HUMAN EVENTS, one can see the two office buildings of the House of Representatives, where Herter served for ten years. The staffers of HUMAN EVENTS many times in the past month have queried those who served with him in Congress; their comment is invariably and in almost identical words: "An awfully nice fellow, but very weak."

The new era of appeasement in American foreign policy and the discarding of the Dulles course was also marked by the unusual trip of President Eisenhower to New York to see the Soviet Exhibition and to meet Soviet Deputy Premier Frol R. Kozlov. Diplomatic Row deemed this a tactical mistake, by evidencing unnecessary eagerness on the part of the US—recently rebuffed by Soviet obstructionism at the Geneva conference—to meet with Soviet high-level personages.

Congressional reaction to Kozlov's visit—highly unfavorable. Senator J. W. Fulbright, talking to Senators Lyndon Johnson and Styles Bridges, tentatively proposed inviting Kozlov to the floor of the Senate as an "honor guest." Bridges burst out: "If you do that, I will rise to a point of order and denounce Kozlov as an emissary of a tyranny which is threatening the whole world today. I would say there is no room for such a person to be introduced on the floor of the Senate." Fulbright promptly retreated and Johnson (as a Presidential candidate wary of such dangerous ground) said to Bridges, "Thank you, Styles."

Kozlov was made guest of honor at the mansion of Averell Harriman in New York City at a luncheon attended by 60 important American businessmen and bankers. Admiral Alan Kirk, former US Ambassador to Moscow, presided. Kirk is recalled as a "weak" envoy whose handling of relations stood in sharp contrast with one of his predecessors, Admiral William H. Standley, who made the Reds recognize and thank Americans for the help given the USSR in 1943-44. The Kirk luncheon is regarded as another effort by an element in US business (led by Eric Johnston and Cyrus Eaton) to put over a Russo-American trade pact and to enable Soviet industry to strengthen itself at America's expense.

Last winter, the then Secretary of Commerce, Lewis L. Strauss, scuttled a similar effort mounted by Johnston

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the time of the visit of Anastas Mikoyan. Russia wanted, and some American industrialists were prepared to sell, about $50 million worth of oil pipe. As the Commerce Department holds the veto on exports of such "strategic" materials, Strauss would not allow the transfer.

Some Capital insiders claim that this veto by Strauss (of help to communism) constituted a big factor behind the subsequent "lynching" of the Secretary by the appeasement-minded Senate "liberals." As one observer put it: "The Communist secret apparatus in this country always inflicts vengeance on its opponents."

Sound Dollar Drive: The President's "sound dollar" crusade, in the opinion of GOP congressional leaders, would gain greatly if he were to take his fiscal case to the country via the networks. No Democratic or Republican conservative on Capitol Hill doubts this. Some observers here believe that such a move would achieve greater dramatic appeal if Eisenhower would take a leaf out of the book of history, for the present economic plight of the US bears no little resemblance to that which faced British Prime Minister J. Ramsay MacDonald in 1931. This canny Scot had a flair for dramatizing economics.

MacDonald, a Laborite, had cast aside his doctrinaire Socialist colleagues and joined with some Tories and Liberals in heading a "National" Government ticket in the general election. Britain's balance of international payments situation, long deteriorating, had reached the stage where that country had to go off the gold standard and economies, higher taxes and unpopular legislation appeared essential to "save the pound."

At election rallies, MacDonald with great effect waved before audiences—as a warning—a handful of inflated German marks of the vintage of 1923. In that year the bottom had fallen out of the German currency, and the life savings of millions were reduced to nothing by galloping inflation.

Americans, who have become aware that their dollar has lost more than half its 1939 value, might well respond more energetically to such an appeal, sounded by President Eisenhower, and might force reluctant members of Congress, controlled by special interests, to cut spending measures and to grant the Treasury such powers as the lifting of the ceiling on the interest rate of Federal bonds.

The recollection of this bit of English history, it is pointed out, is by no means academic. For the British financial crisis of 28 years ago fundamentally arose from the deterioration of the United Kingdom's international balance of payments: exports of goods had declined, while imports of goods rose; meanwhile, interest on foreign investments, shipping revenues, etc., had declined; gold flowed out and a dangerous deficit had become chronic in the international balance of payments.

How does this apply to the US? Last week, four economists told the Joint Congressional Economic Committee that the US would "now have to worry for the first time about deficits in its international balance of payments and the outflow of gold." (*New York Times*, July 1, page 20)

Warren Over Cocktails: Never before has the Nation's Capital witnessed a scene in which a Chief Justice of the US lost his temper at a cocktail party, called another guest a "damned liar" and rudely alluded to the Vice President. Never have the gossips enjoyed such an opportunity to rake over a Chief Justice and offer conclusions so unfavorable to the dignity of the High Court.

According to a tabloid version of what happened, Warren was introduced to Earl Mazo, author of the current book success, *Richard M. Nixon, a Political and Personal Portrait*, and violently abused him, calling him a liar for a chapter in his book dealing with California politics. Reportedly Warren said the book was written to "promote the Presidential candidacy of Nixon" and that "it is a dishonest account to promote Nixon." Mazo argued back and discovered that Warren had not read the whole book, only certain parts of which appeared in a magazine. "I mentioned to the Chief Justice," said Mazo later, "that I hoped when his decisions are made in the Supreme Court, they are made on a more accurate survey of what was going on than his decision on my book."

Apart from the infraction of the dignity which has traditionally been imposed on members of the High Court, comment dwells on the obvious political interest shown by the Chief Justice.

Bystanders among the press draw the conclusion that Warren still harbors aspirations for the Presidency himself—hence his obvious dislike towards Nixon.

The HUMAN EVENTS article (January 6, 1958), entitled "The Web of Warren," noted the rash of "Warren for President" stories in the press which immediately followed Ike's coronary attack in 1955. These could hardly have been published without tacit encouragement from Warren himself. The Chief Justice reportedly stopped saying privately, at that juncture, that he would not leave the bench under any conditions. The implication was drawn that he could be persuaded to run for the Presidency.

Later, in 1957, Warren was invited to attend the American Bar Association meeting in London. He accepted. The British then unofficially suggested that Vice President Nixon might be invited to attend. Abruptly, Warren let it be known that he would not be there if Nixon attended. If Nixon had gone to London, he would have out-ranked the Chief Justice at the meeting in protocol and prestige. The British dropped the idea—thus ending a very significant incident.

Capitol Camera: From White House sources, it is learned exclusively by HUMAN EVENTS that President Eisenhower has been privately urging Vice President Nixon to run for the GOP Presidential nomination. This news, it is logical to expect, will spread and thus will tend to influence many politicos to support Nixon for the nomination.

But the most interesting aspect of this intelligence about the President's urging Nixon to run is that the Vice President, by implication, apparently needs urging.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If that be the implication, then the item in HUMAN EVENTS last week, that Nixon seems uncertain about running, receives confirmation. Or, it may be simply that the Vice President wants to be coaxed by powerful people, such as the President.

● *The Moscow Art Fair fiasco (see* HUMAN EVENTS *for June 24, 1959) grows sillier with each new development. This week Harold McClellan, director of the American Exposition, said he believes he has overcome his biggest problem—pressure from Americans for "untoward" displays which might "embarrass" the Soviet government.*

● Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson discloses a little-known fact: because of a Federal law, only 33 per cent of US wheat farmers are allowed to vote in referenda determining Federal agriculture policy.

Russian Science Equipment: The Soviet Union has been thwarted, temporarily at least, in pulling what the beatniks would call a "real cool" cold war coup.

At the insistence of Senator Styles Bridges (N.H.), ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare appropriations bill passed by the Senate contains the important clause that no part of the taxpayers' money "shall be available for purchase of scientific, mathematical and modern language teaching equipment, or equipment suitable for use . . . in such fields of education, which can be identified as originating in or having been exported from a Communist country unless such equipment is unavailable from any other source."

The bill now goes to conference, and it is of the utmost importance, for psychological and economic reasons—say conservatives—that the House conferees agree with the Senate's restriction on imports of Russian science-teaching instruments.

If, under the Defense Education Act, the Soviets should succeed in placing made-in-Russia science-teaching apparatus in American schools—selling it at an average of one-fifth of the price of comparable equipment made in the US—they would seriously depress our domestic science-teaching equipment industry; at the same time they would plant a time bomb of propaganda in the minds of American youth. It would have an unfortunate impact on children who would be led to believe that the US must use Russian equipment for the teaching of science if America is to "catch up" with the Soviets. The students, quite naturally, might question the merits of capitalism if they thought a Communist country had to be relied upon as a source of "superior" equipment.

But here is the catch, according to Capitol Hill: The Russian material is not better. It is not even cheaper to manufacture than equivalent American-made equipment. It is actually being sold to the US at a financial loss because of the cold war gains Russia expects to accrue from this strategy.

Education: The big-spending "liberals" who dominate the 86th Congress may yet yield to public pressure and balance the Budget for fiscal 1960, but their long-range commitments of Federal money could place a shocking burden on American taxpayers for decades to come. Nowhere is this danger more evident than in the Federal aid to education bill recently reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

This measure (H.R. 22), introduced by Representative Lee Metcalf (D.-Mont.), authorizes $4.5 billion in Federal grants over the next four years for school construction and teachers' salaries. The bill fails to include, however, any provision for ending the program after four years, so, like price supports, the grants would probably continue on and on.

Thus, the cost of this legislation over a 20-year period would total some $87 billion—an amount greater than the entire proposed Federal Budget for the current year and equivalent to approximately one-third of the size of our national debt.

In a dissenting opinion on H.R. 22, ten GOP minority members of the House Committee say:

" . . . [It] would, by producing serious inflationary pressures, tend to undermine our educational system as well as other aspects of our national life. Inflation makes school construction far more costly, and it robs teachers of badly needed purchasing power."

● In St. Louis, last week, delegates to the annual convention of the "liberal" National Education Association (the Nation's most powerful lobby for Federal aid to education) voted overwhelmingly to mobilize support for passage of the Metcalf bill. Only delegates from the Virginia Education Association opposed, on the ground that "to send $1 to Washington to get back 60 cents is a little incongruous." But tremendous NEA pressure on members of Congress is expected.

Conservatives throughout the country are being urged to deluge the Congress with protests against passage of the Federal aid to education measure. It is dangerously close to being voted in.

Strauss: The Senate's rejection of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce made a big hit in Moscow, where *Pravda*—the official Communist party newspaper—called the admiral "a double-eyed reactionary and inveterate enemy of peace."

On the home front, however, the "liberal" movement responsible for the Strauss debacle did not enjoy such a "good press." In fact many publications which champion nearly all left-wing causes were shocked into joining the protests of the conservatives. Even *The New York Times* stepped out of character long enough to call Strauss "a splendid public figure" and to praise those Democrats who voted for his confirmation.

The most devastating counterattack on the anti-Strauss mob, however, was launched by *The Richmond News Leader,* which bluntly stated:

"Lewis Strauss was lynched for opinions; let no hypocritical foe of 'McCarthyism' say otherwise. A conservative Republican, perhaps the most authentic Republican named to a Cabinet post by President Eisenhower, he was the target of every vote-seeking, publicity-craving politician in the Democratic party. 'The Little Tin Gods on Wheels,' as Kipling described the hacks of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

another day, sank to a new low of pettiness in their unwarranted assault."

Then the Richmond paper singled out and admonished some of the leading characters in the political assassination of Admiral Strauss:

"The incredible Mr. Kefauver . . . was a leading antagonist, who sought mightily to play the role of champion of public power for the folks back home in TVA country. . . . And Senator Anderson joined with left-wing scientists to flay Admiral Strauss for his part in branding Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer a 'security risk.' . . . If Magnuson should ever cry out against 'McCarthyism,' he is a rank hypocrite, for his conduct of the Strauss hearings was scandalous. . . .

"And, finally, we come to likable Lyndon Johnson, a cutthroat in pinstripes. Covertly, discreetly, Johnson was ringmaster; without him, there very probably would have been no spectacle. . . . Johnson doubtless sees himself as superbly equipped to sit in the White House . . . but his irresponsibility speaks eloquently of his lack of qualification for any post above the level of party 'fixer.'"

Concluded the *News Leader*: "An innocent man was hung . . . and we believe the American people are smart enough to realize it. Come 1960, they may even be mad enough to do something about it."

Flag Burning: A large crowd of US citizens serenely watching a public burning of the American flag, with newspaper and TV cameras recording the event for all the world to see—such a scene would be hard to imagine, but only the timely intervention by a supreme court justice of the State of Pennsylvania recently prevented this spectacle from taking place.

A US Marine Corps unit, as noted in the *Congressional Record,* was prepared to give a public flag burning demonstration in the rotunda of Pittsburgh's City-County Building as an object lesson on how to dispose of the 48-star standard when replacing it with a new one.

An officer of the Sons of the American Revolution heard about the scheduled program and immediately lodged a telephone protest with State Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno. Visualizing pictures of the incident in Communist-dominated newspapers with captions such as "American flag burned by rioters in front of Government building while US soldiers look on helplessly," Justice Musmanno swung into action.

He contacted program officials and requested the latter not to proceed with the demonstration. A Marine officer said that he had to conduct the flag burning operation because of orders from the Department of Defense. Justice Musmanno then quoted to the Marine officer Public Law 829, 77th Congress, as amended, which prohibits the destruction of the American flag in an undignified manner. The jurist also referred to a section of the Flag Code adopted by the American Legion which requires that the destruction of the flag, when necessary, be done in private.

Justice Musmanno's final word to the Marine unit was that "an act of Congress overrides a Defense Department directive."

The flag burning program was canceled.

McCarthy: Mrs. Joseph R. McCarthy, widow of the Senator from Wisconsin, has given a scorching public refutation of attacks made on her husband by Richard Rovere in his new book, *Senator Joe McCarthy*, as follows:

> The message in this letter is addressed to those of your readers who may have read the book review (in a Washington newspaper) of Richard Rovere's vicious, lying attack upon my husband. It is also in answer to the numerous letters I have received asking why I do not bring a libel action against the author.
>
> I would like to make it clear that I would bring a libel suit if I could. However, the author avoids attacking me. And the law prevents me as Joe's widow from suing for a libel against my husband. The law permits me to sue only for a libel to my own name. The author has very carefully avoided this possibility. He only attacks my husband who is dead and therefore cannot bring a suit to defend himself against such outrageous lies.
>
> While it is a little known fact—and so far an unpublished fact in this case—that a widow cannot bring a libel suit for her husband, the author was well aware of this principle of law as was the magazine which previously printed a scurrilous article by this same author.
>
> Had either this book or the magazine article been printed during my husband's lifetime, he would have brought a libel suit which he would have won unquestionably. Joe, of course, cannot bring a libel suit now.
>
> That such a cowardly device was used in this attempt to hurt my husband and his work is not surprising considering the source. The author himself acknowledges, in a sense, his awareness of this principle of law.
>
> On page 246 he states in a footnote that he would further develop a story but that it "cannot be gone into without involving many living persons." He therefore skips the so-called story. If there were truth to the story he would need have no fear of being sued for libel by the "living persons."
>
> To the thousands of Joe's friends and admirers who have written or phoned me, I would like to say that the vicious lies, the low and mean attacks made upon Joe during his lifetime were recognized by him as part and parcel of the work of fighting communism and exposing Communists.
>
> No one who has done a good job in this field has escaped it. Today Joe is not here to defend himself in a court of law against such attacks. But his work, his life, and his character stand as an adequate answer.
>
> Had Joe's work not been effective, this book written by the former associate editor of *The New Masses*—described by an Attorney General of the United States as a "Communist periodical"—would never have been dreamed up, much less written.

FULTON LEWIS, JR.: "I have read HUMAN EVENTS for fifteen years now, and find it to be the finest publication of its kind. It is aggressive, accurate and informative. Its consistently excellent quality is of enormous help to me in my work."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
JOHN R. BENEDICT, *Assistant Editor* NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, *Assistant Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 27 HUMAN EVENTS July 8, 1959

Article Section I

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Hypocrisy of 'Liberalism'

Why 'Deplore' Communism While Embracing Collectivism?

By E. MERRILL ROOT

ON THE NIGHT when the Titanic sped over the Atlantic, hasty and heedless toward her doom, a naive observer, seeing the visible berg in her path, would have supposed that the danger lay in those high and shimmering spears of silver.

That is a parable of our situation today. We heedlessly hurry on—bands playing, the rich and clever thronging the salons, the officers spick and span upon the bridge, the stokers blind in the bulkheads—toward the waiting iceberg. But all that we watch for, and all that we fear, is the visible ice of open political danger: the Communist military might, our domestic defeat or victory at the polls, the political scoreboard. But these are only the visible spires of the iceberg. What makes them possible? What is their vaster and more deadly base and substratum? What is the submerged and invisible ice of which they are only the upward and visible sign? That is our most crucial question.

Politics are the visible ice—but they are supported by, and exist because of, something else. As the Gospel told us long ago: "In the beginning was the Word." And, even on our human plane, the word (uncapitalized) comes first: as the word, so the deed. Thus our political defeats come from our psychological defeatism. Our inability to crush, or even to contain, communism is caused by our own collectivized ideas and our own socialized ideals. We do not crush it, or even contain it, because its climate already contains our minds and crushes our wills. The political power of our enemies is our own spiritual impotence: they succeed only because we fail.

Even if we won a military victory over communism, the danger might remain. Suppose the Mighty Mo blasted away the top of an iceberg with her big guns . . . and sailed full speed ahead?

The cause of our present debacle is a prevalent psychological climate that creates a dominant intellectual weather. That climate clouds our minds with a continuous confusion of fog which no winds yet scatter, and paralyzes our wills with a zero which no sun of the spirit yet warms into spring. That climate of fog and zero is the climate of "liberalism"—which Richard Weaver rightly calls "the death wish of the West."

Communism, in and by itself, is obviously a zombie that walks like a bear. Its economic determinism, its mechanistic materialism, its politics of the goon squad, its art of the roustabout, its dogmatic ideology and tactics of Murder, Incorporated, are too obviously an idiot's delight to be, by themselves, persuasive. Communism obviously has the retrogressive forehead and protuberant club of some Neanderthal nightmare, some Brachiocephalic Bohunkus. But its Mesozoic manners and saber-tooth methods are forgiven, and its political and economic sterility are forgotten, when its crudity is crammed into a tuxedo and cummerbund by the "liberals" and introduced in the salons of the albumin-brained as "Mr. Progressive Man."

The climate of contemporary "liberalism" is everywhere at work to make communism seem only a bad means toward what is, after all, a good end. For contemporary "liberalism" agrees with communism that mass should be set above man; that the "social" is superior to the individual; that compulsion by group is the right road to Utopia; that economic "security," not personal liberty, is man's goal; that Government, or the state become the mortal god of man's idolatry, is never an automaton of power but always a smiling escalator (going up) for "social justice"; that "scientific" man is his own only creator, whose "social engineering" and positivistic "planning" are the sole means to a good earth. How, then, can "liberalism"—even when it deplores the means of communism—really quarrel with the ends of collectivism? The quarrel of "liberalism" and communism is thus only a lovers' quarrel.

OBSERVE the climate of "liberalism" in the minds of "liberal" anti-Communists. The H. A. Overstreets have just written a book that deplores the manners and methods of communism. But in an earlier book, *The Great Enterprise*, Dr. Overstreet wrote:

> A man, for example, may be angrily against . . . public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, . . . and the preaching of social rather than salvational religion. . . . Such people may appear 'normal' in the sense that they are able to hold a job and otherwise maintain their status as members of society; *but they are, we now recognize, well along the road to mental illness.* (Italics added.)

Dr. Overstreet sincerely believes himself an anti-Communist. Yet, as a "liberal," he assumes—*as premise and axiom*—that any critic of collectivism is *sick*. The honest statement would read: "Anyone who opposes the norms set by Big Brother is mentally sick." Thus the contemporary "liberals" contradict the gallant liberals of history.

Thoreau said: "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he hears, however measured or far away." Walt Whitman bade all the cities and states of America: "Obey little, resist much." But the contemporary "liberal" would dismiss liberals like Thoreau and Whitman as supporters of Fascist and neo-Fascist movements . . . " who would "strike a match across a No Smoking sign." How can such "liberals" object to the encroachments of Big Brother or the characteristic compulsions of the totalitarian state? The answer is: They don't! Instead, they condition us to accept the axiom that Big Brother is always right.

What are the axioms that characterize the climate of "liberalism"?

The contemporary "liberal," in contradiction to the classic liberal, denies the individual and affirms the state. Thoreau, a true liberal, wrote a century ago:

> Yet this Government of itself never furthered any enterprise except when it got out of its way. *It* does not keep the country free. *It* does not settle the West. *It* does not educate. The character inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done somewhat more, if the Government had not sometimes got in the way.

Contrast Thoreau with Senator Joseph S. Clark (D.-Pa.) in the *Atlantic Monthly* for July, 1953. Clark, a leading "liberal," thus defines "liberalism":

> . . . a liberal is here defined as one who believes in using *the full force of Government* for the advancement of social, political, and economic justice at the municipal, state, national, and international levels. . . . *A liberal believes that Government is the proper tool to use in the development of a society which attempts to carry Christian principles of conduct into practical effect.* (Italics added.)

And he boasts that in our schools and colleges:

> . . . spiritually and economically, youth *is conditioned to respond to a liberal* (sic!) *program of the orderly policing of our society by Government,* subject to the popular will, *in the interests of social justice.* (Italics added.)

He means, of course, that the contemporary "liberals" have planted a fixation in the mind of youth, and so increasingly in the minds of all who have been influenced by the academic "intellectuals," that Government *should be* our orderly policeman from the cradle to the grave. And he calls this conditioning of minds, and this emphasis on "policing," *"liberalism."* Is not this the secret nine-tenths of the iceberg which makes plausible and hypnotic the one-tenth of the visible spires that we call "collectivism?"

Even more, the essence of the contemporary "liberal" is his fanatic faith in positivism. The true apostle, both of communism and of "liberalism," is not Karl Marx—but August Comte. Comte ridiculed religion as baseless superstition, and dismissed all metaphysical philosophy as illusion, and thus reduced all life to "positivism"—or a factual and crude "science" that believes only what it can weigh and measure. Life is thus reduced to mere ounces and inches.

And man, in his rationalistic scientism, can, must, and should regard himself as his own creator who is to worship himself and lift himself into Utopia by the seat of his own pants. According to positivism, however, this self-creator is not set only a little lower than the angels: he is an accident that happened to an amoeba. There is nothing metaphysical, nothing transcendental: there is sub-nature but never super-nature: there is only physics, or at best biology. Mind is not a question-mark after matter: matter is a period after mind. Since all this is so, man is "just an animal," and any man who is an "expert" may, without sin, manipulate men (in the interests of Man) as Pavlov manipulated dogs. Man, the measure of all things, may use and abuse man in terms of his own rationalistic opinions (called "ideas"), and his own fantastic whims (called "ideals").

Why wonder that, under such a climate, our art, music, literature, become increasingly negative, nihilistic, death-centered? That our youth becomes the juvenile delinquent or the beatnik? When our philosophy becomes fallacious, denying standards, quality, meaning, our lives lose both joy and noble tragedy, the sanely humorous, the sublime and the heroic. For "liberalism" is "the death wish of the West."

THE WAY OUT? In the beginning is the word. The way of all spirit must renew the way of all flesh. We must have, once more, sound philosophers, who find the absolute above the relative, who thrust their roots again into the metaphysical and the transcendental, who say again that the surface can live only by the Center.

And practically, how much can we do? If "liberal" papers and magazines and books sell by the million, it *is our fault.* We are of the millions who buy them. Our most significant votes are not at the polls—but at the news stands, the book stores, the theaters, the picture galleries: every bad book we buy, every nihilistic play we see, every beatnik picture we praise, is a vote for death. Let us refuse to subscribe to "liberal" papers or buy "liberal" books: let us build up the magazines that send their roots into the real: let us buy the books of Taylor Caldwell, Ayn Rand, Robert Nathan (of *The Portrait of Jennie*), the late Kenneth L. Roberts (of *Boon Island*). Let us develop reviewers who pare Arthur Miller, Tennessee Williams, Archibald MacLeish, down to their true puny size. With our lips and with our lives, with every inch and ounce and atom of our being, we must break the culture of nihilism.

We can do so best by saying No to death and Yes to life.

E. Merrill Root is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana. He has written widely on political subjects. His last contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "The Sickness of Our Schools: 'Progressive' Education," September 15, 1958.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE HYPOCRISY OF 'LIBERALISM'" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 27 HUMAN EVENTS July 8, 1959

Article Section II

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

The Failure of our Educational System

What a University Survey Shows

By DOROTHY THOMPSON

SOCIAL SCIENTISTS at Purdue University have been studying American high-school pupils for years, using the sampling method to obtain from students themselves, in answer to questionnaires, or in letters from pupils, signed and unsigned, a picture of American high-school students. Their first report, issued as a book entitled *The American Teenager*, is startling in many respects, discouraging in some ways, and encouraging in others.

This reader of the report was far more horrified than its authors appear to be to learn from the answers of high-school pupils, whether to specific questions or in more or less spontaneous letters, that the typical high-school student misspells even the simplest words, has not apparently the foggiest notion of grammar or syntax, has failed to learn from "social studies" even the most elementary facts about the American Constitution and American history, geography and science.

The height of illiteracy is struck by a high-school junior who writes in regard to his problems, "It seems like I never have nothing to do and I got to do it, it bores me." One can only ask: How did that boy ever pass grade after grade through eleven years of schooling? Why with his ignorance and boredom should he be in high school at all, instead of learning a trade by practice?

This boy is *not* typical. But there is hardly one communication from pupils that is written in correct grammar without egregious misspelling. Examples (a high-school senior): "The things that make me made *is*—" "I have tried many remmetics (remedies)." "Talking *won't do no* good." . . . "It worked out perfect."

Written by D. H. Radler from the findings of the group headed by H. H. Remmers, this report is filled with interpretations and deductions which doubtless represent the sentiments of the group as a whole. I say "sentiments" advisedly, because the authors are not devoid of their own convictions or prejudices in interpreting the material. They express their own shock at some of the things they find, and are curiously indifferent to other things, finding them more humorous than serious. They appear to be far more concerned, for instance, about the adolescents' attitude toward civil liberties, sex, parents and future career than with their actual accomplishments for their age.

How about the teen-agers' knowledge of American history? Ten per cent of the cross-section queried thought Lincoln wrote the Declaration of Independence. Of science: Over one-third thought the earth the center of the universe. Of geography? Seventy-five per cent think Venezuela is south of the Equator.

A junior in California writes as far as her views are concerned, "Another one of my dislikes is the segregation in the southern school. Our *Constitution* says that all men are created equal but the way *thing* are today, well, *it* a *disgrace*. Just because *thier* skin is black doesn't mean *thier* different *than* white. They want an education, home, job just like anybody else." The authors do not catch her up on confusing the Declaration of Independence with the Constitution.

On the other hand, a sophomore in a North Carolina high school writes one of the most literate and cogently argued letters of those published, in favor of segregation. It contains not one misspelled word and only a very minor grammatical error. He argues that the Supreme Court decision, in his opinion—"I may be wrong"—has usurped the legislative power.

Clearly his views reflect the opinion of the white community in which he lives. But if his letter is at all representative of the literacy achieved in an all-white southern school, and the girl's typical of the literacy of a California mixed school, the letters taken together do not successfully argue the case for desegregation.

IN SUMMING UP the answers received on the subject of civil liberties, the researchers express real shock. They find that the typical teen-ager believes himself and large masses of adult people incapable of deciding what's best; that behavior can and should be scrutinized by police, using wiretapping; and that he endorses censorship of books, newspapers, magazines and other media. Twenty-five per cent would do away with warrants for search of private homes; one-third believe some public assemblages should be prohibited; 13 per cent would restrict by law religious belief and worship.

I find it dangerous to draw deductions from answers that must be made by "yes" or "no," without explanation or qualification, and significant that the researchers did not query the pupils at all about one item in the Bill of Rights (in the famous Fifth Amendment), namely, that "no person . . . (can be) deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

But how can young people be expected to defend the constitutional American liberties, or even recognize them as such, if they confuse the Declaration of Independence with the Emancipation Proclama-

Reprinted by special permission of the *Ladies Home Journal*. Copyright 1957 by The Curtis Publishing Company.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion; do not recognize a slight paraphrase of the Constitution when they see it, and quite evidently have never been taught constitutional origins and background, or learned why the eighteenth-century men who wrote it wished to curb and check the powers of Government?

The researchers who compiled the report repeatedly betray their own biases. A majority of high-school students (57 per cent), and a much larger one (72 per cent) of college students, queried by *Time* agreed that "Democracy depends fundamentally on the existence of free enterprise." The authors comment, "The experts disagree with this statement because they are aware that *individual* rights (italics theirs) are more fundamental to democracy than free enterprise."

It is here that this reader agrees with the pupils and disagrees with the "experts." Is not opportunity freely to engage in economic enterprise and accumulate and be secure in property also an *individual* right? And do the authors know of any country in which free business enterprise has been taken over in all sectors of the economy and other freedoms retained?

Actually, answers to specific questions reveal that from 11 per cent to 62 per cent share one or another Socialist idea—that Government should abolish inheritances, own basic industries, control railroads and mines, run all banks and credit; that the price of goods should be limited by the cost of production; that large idle estates should be divided among the poor for farming.

THE RESEARCHERS apparently see no danger in the prevalence of these ideas, and object to the prevailing view of the students that communism and fascism amount to the same thing, again saying that "the experts" think differently. The researchers display other biases. They publish a really moving letter from a girl who, wishing to be popular with the boys, got a reputation for being all too easy, but who, after great effort, had decided against permitting any kind of sexual play and has finally found that although this attitude has limited her range of dates it has not precluded companionship with the best and cleanest boys.

The researchers comment, "She might have profited from being taught that sex experience, if it stops short of intercourse, is conducive to growth and valuable as preparation for marriage." Just who should have taught her that promiscuous necking, if only interrupted at the critical point, is valuable in any way? Her mother? Her teachers? How many cases of rape arise from the frustrations of such interruptions? And how many high-school pregnancies from going one very short step too far?

The researchers have discovered that typical American teen-agers have strong religious leanings without being dogmatic, that they go to church regularly, believe God is an omnipotent and omniscient Spirit.

The fact emerges from the researchers that American teen-agers are, on the whole, conservative, and tend toward orthodoxy and conformity, largely reflecting the views of their parents and those prevailing in the communities in which they live. They are not independent-minded—which to my mind is explicable by the fact that they are actually *not* independent, but dependent on others.

EVIDENCE OF "superpatriotism" is reflected in the opinion of 74 per cent of the youth queried that foreign *countries* have little to contribute to American progress; by 28 per cent who object to flying the UN flag over that of the USA; by 37 per cent who think immigration should be restricted, as endangering the American standard of living; by 42 per cent who believe we should firmly resist attempts to change the American way of life.

"Superpatriots," comment the authors, "are poorly informed and easily swayed by high-sounding phrases." But without further querying to ascertain the frames of reference from which those queried make their judgments one should be cautious about deductions.

Do foreign "countries" contribute to American progress? What is meant by "country"? A state? A culture? Unless that question is clear in one's mind the answer is meaningless.

The miracle of adolescence is that anyone survives it. Fifty per cent of the youth covered by the Purdue study feel that actual work experience would be more useful to them than school—and those who make up that 50 per cent are probably right about themselves. But "child" labor laws and trade-union regulations keep thousands in school who might better be learning (and earning) as apprentices to a trade.

One final word: All of them, almost without exception, believe that high school can (and will) prepare them for their life occupation, and are harassed immeasurably by being unable to choose and plan for it. High school will not and cannot. A teenager rarely knows what he really wants to do or has ability to do, and if he is harried to make up his mind or encouraged to count on getting just the job he wants, he is in for disappointments. The function of education—as I see it—is to fit the youth to do *anything* that can reasonably be expected or demanded after twelve years of schooling and character building. If we are not succeeding in this our public education is a failure.

Dorothy Thompson, long a syndicated newspaper columnist, has occupied a prominent position as a commentator on the affairs of the Nation. Her last article in HUMAN EVENTS was "The Struggle for Influence," August 18, 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE FAILURE OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED